

20734

July 24, 1963

Mr. Melvin M. Belli
Belli, Ashe and Gerry
San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Mr. Belli,

In your book "Dallas Justice" there appears a series of documents relating to the autopsy performed on Lee Harvey Oswald. These appear on pages 277-290. I am writing to ask your permission to use these should I so desire in my own book, to which I referred in my letter of July 14.

If it is not asking too much, if you have a Xeroxed copy of the originals to spare, I'm very much like to have it. It is possible, assuming the book is published in the United States, I might want to reproduce some of these documents.

My greatest interest is in the documents on pages 284 (autopsy permit) and 286-9 (body charts).

The purpose for which I might use these does not relate to Mr. Ruby. My book almost ignores him. It is an analysis of the Warren Report and not of either the assassination of the President or the other two murders.

In writing you ten days ago I perhaps should have told you more of my book, which I completed in mid-February. The publisher broke his contract. It was read and praised by a number of other publishers, both large and prominent, all of whom declined to print it and some of whom candidly gave fear of the government as their reason. It is presently under active consideration by two major publishers abroad, where it is represented by a major agent. My first agent in the United States resigned. The next four I approached were interested in me as a new client but totally without interest when they heard the title. This includes an agent to whom I was sent by a major magazine, which was considering a 20,000 word summary. After reading the manuscript, which he described as "a really excellent job", Max Wilkinson, of Littaur and Wilkinson, major agents in New York, said he'd represent me but without optimism. Two weeks ago he informed me he thinks there is now no chance any United States publisher will print the book. This does not mean that I am discontinuing my own efforts to get the book published here. However, about a dozen and a half publishers have so far declined. All these who commented described the book as conclusive, moderate, well written, etc. Apparently, one of the problems is that it is too conclusive. Except for purposes of comparison, it draws exclusively upon the official information of the Commission, in its Report and the 26 appended volumes. Despite your long career in the law, I think it will shock you. It is not in accord with your quoted opinion and, in my belief, completely disproves the major conclusions of the Commission.

For the time being, I'd appreciate it if you preserve what I have told you in confidence. By a strange coincidence, the publisher who had contracted for the book had intended to distribute it through your publisher, McKay, with whom he at the same time also broke his contract.